

Date: Sun, 22 Aug 93 04:30:08 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #302  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Sun, 22 Aug 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    302

Today's Topics:

    "Distance Education" and ATV  
    Bootlegger At ARRL N.E. Convention  
    CW Privileges (3 msgs)  
    Techs on 20M ? Crossband repeat.

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 20 Aug 93 23:14:11 GMT  
From: newsstand.cit.cornell.edu!newsstand.cit.cornell.edu!usenet@cu-  
arpa.cs.cornell.edu  
Subject: "Distance Education" and ATV  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <uXXJ9B2w165w@inqmind.bison.mb.ca> Bill Shymanski,  
bills@inqmind.bison.mb.ca writes:

>I'd like to hear from any amateurs with direct knowledge of use of  
>the ham bands for "distance education" projects, in other words the  
>transmission of regular educational programs on amateur frequencies.  
>Duration of the program, co-ordination with regular amateur activities,  
>bands used, types of courses transmitted, equipment chosen, and  
>contrast with use of commercial frequencies would all be of interest.  
>  
> This is an attempt to gather some information that will dispel rumours  
>circulating locally - I'm not proposing such operations myself and I've  
>good reason to believe they are not permitted in amateur bands. However,  
>I'd like to get some additional information on such problems occurring

>elsewhere.  
> If there's enough interest, in a week or two I'll post a summary and  
>the history of the local problem.  
> Bill  
> VE4STW  
>  
>bills@inqmind.bison.mb.ca

Hmmm, well our local club has been considering working on our licensing classes using our ATV repeater to help out. We normally do the intro classes in person, but there has been a number of requests for upgrade classes from tech to general, advanced and extra. We ran a pretty sucessful class a year ago on the local 2m repeater for tech to general, and we thought that since we were developing some homebrewed video for the other licensing efforts, that we could transmit it (as of general interest to the amateur community - I mean when was the last time you saw CW/AM/SSB in frequency domain) and have a chat session around it. There is also the possibility of non hams watching and maybe calling into the net via a station dedicated to phone patching them in or relaying their questions (done in a local ham/swl net with no problems - and a nice way to include non hams) I guess that would be a distance learning type scenario - but I don't think it would be a problem under current rules and the intent of the rules. (I might be wrong - we haven't actually done it yet, but no one has raised any flags when we've discussed it). Since we have a larger group here, anybody see any problems with that scenario?

I think I would have problems if someone were using ATV to hold classes that were paid for. Or on subjects far from the beam (though hams are interested in pretty much everything in my experience) or to a primarily non-amateur audience. What are the particulars in your case? I've noticed that when it becomes 'TV', everyone sort of feels a little different about what is allowed, vs talking type radio. Maybe it's because we are used to seeing programming 'presented' (if that's the right term for spewing drivels) in a certain fashion and feel like we should emulate it. People sort of go into a 'broadcast' mentality - and you start dancing with the one way transmission rules. I'd be curious what other people think about what's legal and not on ATV. We're just getting into it up here in upstate NY.

73 de Kevin, WB2EMS (fkf1@cornell.edu)

"Without the Second Amendment, the rest of the Constitution is just paper"

-----

Date: Sun, 22 Aug 1993 03:30:48 GMT

From: sdd.hp.com!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!kd4nc!n4tii@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Bootlegger At ARRL N.E. Convention

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dadams@cray.com (David Adams) writes:

>In article 082928@IASTATE.EDU, wjturner@IASTATE.EDU (William J Turner) writes:

>|

>|FYI--The original posting said the woman went to a testing session and said she  
>|had \*no\* ham license. She then \*failed\* the Technician exams. (Not that this  
>|really matters, since she still wouldn't be able to transmit the same day.) She  
>|was then seen talking into her HT latter the same day. Assuming of course that  
>|her HT was a ham radio (as opposed to a radio for some other band), then she  
>|clearly either lied to the VEs or was transmitting illegally. End of  
>|discussion.

>NOT! The CAP for instance has frequencies on either side of the 2 m ham band.  
>CAP operators regularly use ham HTs or other ham gear capable of transmitting  
>out of band or on CAP frequencies. Some CAP operators have ham licenses, others  
>do not. They are not operating illegally. MARS is similar. How do you know  
>this "Bootlegger" is not a CAP or MARS operator?

>---

>David, NOWWN/AA

> November Zero Wiskey Wiskey November

>--David C. Adams Statistician Cray Research Inc. dadams@cray.com

> -Sourdough and Ham- - Minnesotans for Global Warming! -

> (&gardner)

David, I posted a message very similar to this over in r.r.a.misc . However,  
you DO need a ham license to be in MARS....but you're absolutely right about  
her possibly being a CAP operator.

John Reed, 11t CAP  
ham, afmars, cap

n4tii%kd4nc.uucp@gatech.edu y

-----  
Date: 20 Aug 1993 16:40:27 -0700

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!asuvax!  
chnews!ornews.intel.com!ornews.intel.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: CW Privileges

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>>I feel this is intellectual elitism. Usenet is filled with college  
>>grads that have learned to study and take test. The rest of the world  
>>that barely made it through high school doesn't post here.

Efete snobs? They will DENY it!

>I must use a have a different definition of incentive.

Swedish?

Me a too.

Anybody can receive. A ham license is a license to transmit. Code requirements for licensing should be a 5 WPM sending test, di-dah-di-dah-di-dah A ham license should be a license to LEARN more about transmitting, not a license to transmit. Or should be IMHO. Theory questions should be restricted to general information about careful and correct transmitting equipment installation and operation.

Questions on the amateur exams requiring memorization of specific industry or military terminology should be omitted. (RG-58, PL-259)

--

WA7LDV zardoz@ornews.intel.com

<<<ZARDOZ>>>

-----  
Date: Sat, 21 Aug 1993 00:09:25 GMT  
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!nuntius@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: CW Privileges  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CC2pH3.2Ln@fc.hp.com> Perry Scott, perry@fc.hp.com writes:

>  
>In the olde days, there was a written test and a practical test. The  
>practical test was chosen to be CW.  
>  
>Maybe we need a new practical test.

In the Navy we use to brag? 200 years un-changed by progress.....

-----  
Date: Sat, 21 Aug 1993 00:08:34 GMT  
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!nuntius@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: CW Privileges  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CC2pH3.2Ln@fc.hp.com> Perry Scott, perry@fc.hp.com writes:

>  
>In the olde days, there was a written test and a practical test. The  
>practical test was chosen to be CW.  
>  
>Maybe we need a new practical test.

In the Navy we use to brag? 200 years un-changed by progress.....

-----  
Date: 21 Aug 1993 03:42:38 GMT  
From: drt@athena.mit.edu  
Subject: Techs on 20M ? Crossband repeat.  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <251956\$c5o@news.delphi.com> edellers@news.delphi.com  
(EDELLERS@DELPHI.COM) writes:

Ah zo! THAT clears things up.

Considering WHY foreign countries often prohibit third-party -- namely to protect their PTT monopolies -- I'm not sure that this would ever be a real problem. (And I'm not sure what business the FCC has helping enforce a foreign rule...)

I agree. I don't think the FCC would ever care, but they do have to enforce treaties (which bar 3d party traffic w/o an agreement).

Why \*France\* would really care, I don't know either.

-drt

--

-----  
David R. Tucker           KG2S           drt@athena.mit.edu

|'Most political sermons tech the congregation nothing except        |  
what newspapers are taken at the Rectory.' -C.S. Lewis

-----  
Date: Sun, 22 Aug 1993 03:21:35 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!emory!kd4nc!  
n4tii@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Aug17.195329.13550@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>,  
<1993Aug20.082928@IASTATE.EDU>, <252tta\$5vf@zephyr.ens.tek.com>  
Subject : Re: Bootlegger At ARRL N.E. Convention

ronk@cascade.ens.tek.com (Ron Kirkpatrick) writes:

>In article <1993Aug20.082928@IASTATE.EDU>, wjturner@IASTATE.EDU (William J

Turner) writes:

>|> FYI--The original posting said the woman went to a testing session and said she  
>|> had \*no\* ham license. She then \*failed\* the Technician exams. (Not that this  
>|> really matters, since she still wouldn't be able to transmit the same day.)  
She  
>|> was then seen talking into her HT latter the same day. Assuming of course  
that  
>|> her HT was a ham radio (as opposed to a radio for some other band), then she  
>|> clearly either lied to the VEs or was transmitting illegally. End of  
>|> discussion.  
>|>  
>|> However, the radio could have been for a different band (the original poster  
may  
>|> have actually seen the radio's model number and recognized it as definitely  
>|> being a ham radio, but I don't know for sure), and thus she was not  
necessarily  
>|> transmitting illegal. (Of course, she could still have been, but we have no  
way  
>|> to know.)

>One other question that would need to be answered:

>Was there an amateur standing next to her and acting as a control operator?

One guy mentioned something that most of you failed to take into consideration.

The woman could have been in CAP. CAP rigs need not be commercial rigs, only  
pass some very simple spectral purity checks, like most ham rigs do.

So, my guess is that 1, she in fact was bootlegging, or 2, she was a CAP op  
that was waiting for thinking of getting her ticket.... too bad the guy did  
not get a good look at her operating frequency...

(I think, for the most part, that she indeed was bootlegging)

John Reed, n4tii

(Y'all congratulate me, I graduated college Friday night!)

n4tii%kd4nc.uucp@gatech.edu

>--

>Ron Kirkpatrick  
>News Administrator/Postmaster  
>Tektronix, Inc  
>503-627-6707

-----  
Date: Fri, 20 Aug 1993 15:23:18 GMT  
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!destroyer!  
nnntp.cs.ubc.ca!alberta!adec23!ve6mgs!mark@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Aug11.093754.1357@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>,  
<1993Aug13.201401.12050@Csl.Stanford.EDU>,  
<1993Aug14.023012.15152@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>  
Subject : Re: Lead the Way! (was Re: code/nocode blah blah blah)

rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu (Rod Anderson) expounds brilliantly:  
>>In any event, the definition you quote was the secondary (at least according  
>>to webster), with the primary being "the use of memory usu. with little  
>>intellegence".  
>  
>That is a good definition of the Morse fans on the net !

A bit Ad Hom OM! wouldn't you say?

You would be pretty hard pressed to find an HF SSB operator carrying on such a  
pleasurable, patient, chat as a CW operator! The art of conversation on CW is  
alive and well because many of us 'Morse fans' write down and respond to what  
is being said by the other person in the QS0. Meanwhile, I usually find two  
one way QS0s going on when two SSB operators are at it ... (This is not to  
say that the two sides of this debate appear to be doing the same! ;-)

Ciao, 73 de VE6MGS/Mark -sk-

So many sides to this hobby, why is this debate so flat?

Ciao Mark Salyzyn mark@ve6mgs.ampr.ab.ca|mark@adec23.UUCP

- Entries to the Amateurs on USENET List: hams-on-usenet@ve6mgs.ampr.ab.ca
- Postings to rec.radio.info: rec-radio-info@ve6mgs.ampr.ab.ca
- rec.radio.info administrivia: rec-radio-request@ve6mgs.ampr.ab.ca

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #302

\*\*\*\*\*